

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION

LEON HAWKINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 1:25-cv-01112-JDB-jay

PAUL JENNKING, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
DISMISSING CASE WITH PREJUDICE,
AND
DENYING MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AS MOOT

On April 24, 2025, the Plaintiff, Leon Hawkins, filed a pro se complaint in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan against various individuals alleging violation of his civil rights. (Docket Entry (“D.E.”) 1.) He also applied to proceed in the case in forma pauperis (“IFP”). (D.E. 2.) The matter was transferred to this district on April 28, 2025. (D.E. 5.) Under Administrative Order No. 2013-05, the action was then referred to the assigned magistrate judge in this district, Jon A. York, for management of all pretrial matters. In a screening report and recommendation entered May 2, 2025, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (the “R&R”), Judge York recommended that Plaintiff’s claims be dismissed with prejudice and that his motion to proceed IFP be denied as moot. (D.E. 11.) The magistrate judge further recommended that Hawkins be declared a vexatious litigant and enjoined from filing new complaints or from submitting new filings in closed cases without obtaining prior approval. The basis for the latter recommendation was Plaintiff’s engagement in a long campaign of litigating the same perceived wrongs he and his wife have allegedly endured at the hands of various entities and individuals.

See, e.g., Hawkins v. Judge Bond, et al., Case No. 1:25-cv-01009-STA-jay (W.D. Tenn.) (dismissed Mar. 3, 2025); *Hawkins v. Pastor Lylod, et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-01008-JDB-jay (W.D. Tenn.) (dismissed Mar. 28, 2025); *Hawkins v. Judge Moores, et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-01007-STA-jay (W.D. Tenn.) (dismissed Mar. 3, 2025). In *Lylod*, the undersigned directed Plaintiff to refrain from filing cases concerning these issues and warned that filing restrictions may be imposed to deter future abusive or vexatious conduct. (*See Lylod*, Case No. 1:25-cv-01008-JDB-jay, D.E. 14 at PageID 18.)

In *Hawkins v. MTD Plant, et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-01107-JDB-jay (W.D. Tenn.), Plaintiff again sought relief concerning the same issues against a cadre of individuals, and claimed in an attachment to the complaint that the same persons named as defendants in this lawsuit caused injury to him and his wife. (*See MTD Plant*, Case No. 1:25-cv-01107-JDB-jay, D.E. 1 at PageID 6.) In an order adopting Judge York's recommendation that the case be dismissed with prejudice, entered May 23, 2025, the Court stated:

Plaintiff is further declared a vexatious litigant, is enjoined from filing any new petitions or complaints in this Court, or from submitting any new filings in any cases in this Court that have been closed, without first seeking and obtaining the Court's permission to file. Plaintiff is admonished that he cannot avoid these filing restrictions by filing in other courts.

(*Id.*, D.E. 13 at PageID 12.)

Returning to the instant case, the R&R herein advised Plaintiff that any objections to the recommendation must be filed within fourteen days. No objections have been filed and the time for doing so has expired. As no objection has been made to the R&R, it is hereby ADOPTED and the case is DISMISSED with prejudice. Further, the motion for IFP is DENIED as moot. Finally, Hawkins is reminded that, pursuant to the Court's declaration that he is a vexatious litigant, he is enjoined from submitting any new filings in this matter absent prior permission.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of June 2025.

s/ J. DANIEL BREEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE